1. Introduction

Nonprofit organisations (NPOs) are labour-intensive entities. They base their activities on motivated, committed staff who represent a peculiar set of characteristics and behaviours that enable the emergence of a specific, community-driven atmosphere.

Employees often contribute to nonprofit activities without being paid. For this reason, the literature devotes much attention to the problems of volunteering and volunteering management. In recent years, the prism of considering labour topics in the third sector has broadened. Fuelled by enterprise research, there is a growing interest in exploring the behaviours of all categories of employees (not just volunteers) that go beyond role-related requirements. This is one of the reasons why the concept of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) is being adapted to the context of the third sector (Aranda et al. 2018; Erks et al. 2021; Nonnis et al. 2020; Pimthong 2016; van Schie et al. 2015).

The activity of a nonprofit organisation, as already mentioned, requires highly motivated
and committed staff. At the same time, however, employment in NPOs proves exhausting in terms of working conditions given that such organisations often deal with complex social issues that require resilience to stress. Solving these problems on a macroscale depends on external, that is institutional, factors. This in turn fuels the sense of agency among NPOs employees, and consequently, takes a high emotional and health toll on them. Employees in NPOs frequently grapple with fatigue, stress, pressure to work more, as well as a sense of powerlessness related to external obstacles in the implementation of their mission (Cypryańska-Nezlek, 2020). In such conditions, it is easy to experience burnout. According to Deng et al. (2021), employees in nonprofits are marked by high burnout rates. This was also confirmed by comparative studies carried out among managers of nonprofit, for-profit and public organisations, in which the highest rate of professional burnout was reported among NPOs leaders (Seiler and Bortnowska, 2021).

In the literature we find studies analysing different relationships between OCBs and job burnout (e.g. Baranik and Eby, 2016; Brown and Roloff, 2015; Kim, 2018; Pohl et al. 2023; Schepman and Zarate, 2008; Wang et al. 2022). However, they were conducted in for-profits and public organisations, while no such studies having been identified in NPOs. There is therefore a cognitive gap and a research gap in this area.

The aim of the article is to define the correlation between job burnout and organisational citizenship behaviours among employees of nonprofits.

The article is divided into 9 sections. In the introduction, the directions of research on organisational citizenship behaviours, the research gap and the purpose of the article are synthetically laid out. In the second section, the results of the literature review on OCBs are presented, while the third section addresses the job burnout. Section four discusses the relationship between OCBs and JB. Section five contains a description of our research methodology, and section six is where the results are shared. In the last sections, the results are benchmarked with some of the findings of other authors, conclusions were indicated as well as limitations and directions of future research.

2. Organisational Citizenship Behaviours

As per Organ (1988, p. 4; cf. Organ, 2018), OCB ‘is an individual behaviour that is discretionary, not explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization’. OCB is viewed as individual behaviour which nonetheless has a cumulative effect
on the activities of employees, work teams and the organisation as a whole. Relationships between OCBs and, among others, organisational performance, including profitability, productivity, product quality, efficiency have been demonstrated (Podsakoff et al. 2013; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff et al. 1997).

From a theoretical standpoint however, doubts were raised by the discretionary aspect of the definition proposed by Organ. It was pointed out that citizenship behaviour is a function of how employees perceive their duties at work (Morrison, 1994). It was also stressed that these can be expected by supervisors and coworkers, and therefore formally recognized and rewarded. Some studies have shown that these behaviours are factored in by managers, e.g. in the processes of recruitment (Podsakoff et al. 2011) and employee evaluation (MacKenzie et al. 1993). Building on the findings of Rioux and Penner (2001; cf. Bolino, 1999), attempted impression management may also spawn these behaviours. In other words, they can be used to shape a certain image in the eyes of colleagues and superiors with a view to obtaining specific rewards in return.

Doubts about whether OCBs can be classified as behaviours that go beyond role requirements have propelled alternative notions. Graham (1991; cf. Van Dyne et al. 1994) put forward a conceptualization of organisational citizenship behaviours that includes traditional in-role behaviours, extra-role behaviours, and political behaviours. From this point of view, OCB is an enlarged form of job performance and is not merely extra-role. Let us also note that Organ (1997) went on to modify his definition, stating that OCB supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place. In so doing, as noted by LePine et al. (2002), he aligned the definition of OCB with that of Contextual Performance proposed by Borman and Motowidlo (1997). Van Dyne et al. (1995), however, found that the distinction between in-role and extra-role behaviours - despite application difficulties with precise distinction between the two forms - has an important theoretical value (they classified OCBs as affiliative and promotive extra-role behaviours). This may prove important for the research of OCBs in nonprofits, as these tend to be less formalised and hierarchical than public and for-profit organisations (Anheier, 2005). In addition, nonprofits largely rely on the input of volunteers with a flexible scope of duties.

This begs the question about the similarity of OCBs and volunteer work. According to Finkelstein and Penner (2004, p. 384; Finkelstein, 2006), these are behaviours that ‘involve long-term, planned, and discretionary acts that occur in an organizational context and that benefit nonintimate others’. Three common
features of OCBs and (formal) volunteering can therefore be identified (Rioux and Penner, 2001). First, they are discretionary prosocial behaviours. Secondly, they occur within the organisational context and the recipients of the benefits are entities related to the organisation or the organisation as a whole. Thirdly, in both cases there is no personal or social obligation to help. Let us stress another significant difference between volunteering and OCBs, consisting in the fact that, unlike volunteerism, OCBs are directed to familiar recipients (Van Emmerik et al. 2003).

When discussing the essence of OCBs, it is important to establish the dimensions of these behaviours. Smith et al. (1983) identify to this end altruism and generalised compliance. Organ (1988) lists as many as five dimensions: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Podsakoff et al. (2000), based on the examination of literature, expand it even further to include the following: helping behaviour, sportsmanship, organisational loyalty, organisational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, self-development. OCB taxonomies were also developed, among others, by: Graham (1991), Borman et al. (2001), Van Dyne et al. (1995). However, reporting after Williams and Anderson (1991), in many studies OCBs are reduced to: OCBI - behaviours directed at individuals and groups within the organisation, and OCBO - behaviours directed at the organisation as a whole (cf. MacKenzie et al. 2018).

An important part of the research on OCBs is testing the relationships of this type of behaviour with different variables. In previous studies, individual differences: agreeableness, conscientiousness, positive and negative affectivity (Borman et al. 2001; Konovsky and Organ, 1996; Organ and Lingl, 1995; Organ and Ryan, 1995), equity sensitivity (Blakely, Andrews and Moorman, 2005; Konovsky and Organ, 1996), locus of control (Blakely, Srivastava and Moorman, 2005; Borman et al. 2001), emotional intelligence (Turnipseed, 2017), empathy (McNeely and Meglino, 1992), motives, motive fulfilment and role identity (Finkelstein and Penner, 2004; Finkelstein, 2006; Rioux and Penner, 2001) have been tested for. The corelations between OCBs and the cognitive and affective components of attitude have been studied as well (Lee and Allen, 2002; Organ and Konovsky, 1989), and so has been the relationship between OCBs and emotions experienced in the workplace (Ziegler et al. 2002). Moreover, the links between OCBs and leader behaviours have been analysed (Babcock-Roberson and Strickland, 2010; Harris et al. 2014; Podsakoff et al. 1990; Podsakoff et al. 1996a, 1996b), and so have been factors related to the characteristics of work and the functioning of the organisation, e.g.: organisational formalisation, organisational inflexibility,
spatial distance (Podsakoff et al. 1996a, 1996b), perceived organisational support (Moorman et al. 1998; Alshaabani et al. 2021) or social support (Bastian and Sogirin, 2022; Han, 2010; Kim et al. 2013), workplace environment (Turnipseed and Murkison, 1996).

Lastly (or rather firstly, chronologically speaking), OCBs have also been examined in relation to attitudinal and perceptual variables: job satisfaction (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith et al. 1983) organisational justice (Farh et al. 1990; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993), organisational commitment (Moorman et al. 1993; Williams and Anderson, 1991). We might also include in this dimension research on the correlations between OCBs and work engagement (Urbini et al. 2020), work alienation (Suárez-Mendoza and Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, 2008), as well as job burnout (e.g., Abate et al. 2018; Carlson and Thompson, 1995; Lizano and Barak, 2015; Low et al. 2001).

The concept of OCB, as developed by organisational psychologists, has been adapted in recent years also on the basis of research into the nonprofit sector. Pimthong (2016), for one, examined the relationship between OCBs and organisational commitment, leadership and team effectiveness in NPOs. Erks et al. (2021) analysed OCBs’ relationship with volunteer meaningfulness and nature of volunteer activity, Aranda et al. (2018) – with psychological contract breach, van Schie et al. (2015) – with organisational context. Nonnis et al. (2020) conducted research in an Italian nonprofit dealing with blood donations.

3. Job burnout

The authors of the most common definition of job burnout are Maslach and Jackson (1981, p. 1), who defined it as ‘a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do <<people-work>> of some kind’. According to these authors, JB consists of three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). ‘Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of being overextended and exhausted by the emotional demands of one’s work. Depersonalization is characterized by a detached and cynical response to the recipients of one’s service or care. Finally, reduced personal accomplishment refers to the self-evaluation that one is no longer effective in working with recipients and in fulfilling one’s job responsibilities’ (Demerouti et al. 2001, p. 499, after: Maslach et al. 1996). In relation to that concept, the two above-mentioned authors developed the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach and Jackson, 1981; Maslach et al. 1996).
The authors of the first publications on JB stated, that it affects only representatives of social services, such as doctors, emergency services, care workers and teachers (Schaufeli and Buunk, 2003). However, over the years, subsequent empirical studies found that JB can concern all employees, regardless of the type of job they perform (cf.: Leiter and Maslach, 2023; Leiter and Schaufeli, 1996; Maslach et al. 2008).

According to some authors, the MBI has several shortcomings, both theoretical and psychometric ones (see more: Demerouti et al. 2001; Kalliath, 2000; Lee and Ashforth, 1996; Leiter, 1993). In response to these shortcomings, Demerouti et al. (2001) prepared an alternative questionnaire – the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI). It is based on a model similar to that of the MBI, but considers only 2 dimensions: exhaustion and disengagement from work.

The factors influencing job burnout have been examined in many studies. Cordes and Dougherty (1993) categorised burnout-related factors into 3 groups: job and role characteristics, organisational characteristics and personal characteristics. Maslach and Leiter (2005) identified 2 groups of factors which dominate the people before JB. The first group (situational predictors) include 6 antecedents: workload, control, award, social network, job fairness, and values. The second group contains the following individual antecedents: age, gender, marital status, experience (cf. Shoman et al. 2021).

The results of job burnout were also analysed by researchers. It is an important predictor of the physical consequences (e.g. hypercholesterolemia, obesity, type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, musculoskeletal pain, changes in pain experiences, prolonged fatigue, headaches, gastrointestinal issues, severe injuries, respiratory problems, mortality below the age of 45 years) as well as the psychological ones (e.g. insomnia, mood disorders, depressive symptoms, use of psychotropic and antidepressant treatment, hospitalisation for mental disorders and psychological ill-health symptoms). Job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, new disability pension, job demands, job resources, new disability pension, and presenteeism were identified as occupational outcomes (Salvagioni et al. 2017; cf. Aronsson et al. 2017; Bakker and de Vries, 2021; Bakker et al. 2023; Bayes et al. 2021; Edú-Valsanía et al. 2022; Lizano, 2015; Patel et al. 2018; Seiler et al. 2023). ‘A central problem in the burnout literature is that interventions to effectively prevent and reduce burnout are often advocated, but rarely designed and studied’ (see more: Demerouti et al. 2021, p. 689).

Job burnout may be experienced not only by the employees of for-profits (e.g. Abate et al. 2018; Low et al. 2001; Yang et al. 2017) or in public organisations
(e.g. Lizano and Barak, 2015; Carlson and Thompson, 1995; Lee, 2018), but also in nonprofits (e.g. Craiovan, 2015; Pomerantz, 1991; Romina, 2016). Moreover, cross-sector research by Seiler and Bortnowska (2021) demonstrated that NPO managers are marked by the highest rate of professional burnout compared to the representatives of the managerial staff employed in the other types of entities.

Researchers dealing with the problem of job burnout in NPOs have looked into, among others, predictive indicators of this phenomenon in nonprofit organisations, breaking them down into two general categories: individual personality factors and organisational environment factors (Pomerantz, 1991). Deng et al. (2021) examined the effects of job demands and job resources on job burnout and psychological distress experienced by nonprofit employees. Job burnout among people performing certain professions in nonprofit organisations was also examined, e.g. Romina (2016) analysed this problem among psychologists, Leung (2009) - among social workers, and Craiovan (2015) - among persons who worked in the domain of social services, psychology and kinesiotherapy.

4. Organisational citizenship behaviours and job burnout

In the literature we find studies that analysed the links between OCBs and job burnout; they were conducted in for-profit and public organisations only (e.g. Baranik and Eby, 2016; Kim, 2018; Brown and Roloff, 2015; Schepman and Zarate, 2008; Wang et al. 2022). But the resulting findings are not clear. Sesen et al. (2011; cf. Wang et al. 2022) found a statistically significant negative relation between JB and OCB dimensions (p<.01), except for between emotional exhaustion and OCB-I (r=.04, p>.05) and between depersonalization and OCB-O (r=-.24, p>.05). According to these authors, the only contributor of the burnout dimension on OCB-O (toward organisation) was the reduced personal accomplishment while emotional exhaustion and depersonalization had no effect. Cropanzano et al. (2003) found that emotional exhaustion only effected OCB-O (β=-.19; p<.01) negatively and had no effect on OCB-I. Van Emmerik et al. (2005; cf. Nasiri, 2015) reported a negative relation between OCB and reduced personal accomplishment (β=-.45; p<.01) and between altruism and emotional exhaustion (r= -.23; p<.01). Chiu and Tsai (2006) identified negative correlations between OCB and emotional exhaustion (β= -.19; p<.01) and reduced personal accomplishment (β= -.55; p<.001).
The relationship between OCBs and burnout are also analysed taking into account variables such as: motivation (Margaretha, 2019; cf. Kim, 2018), job satisfaction (Sesen et al. 2011), flow (Kasa and Hasan, 2015), organisational support and psychological contract fulfilment (Brown and Reloff, 2015), performance management fairness (Bauwens et al. 2019), ethical climate (Wang et al. 2022), workplace incivility (Liu et al. 2022), affective and/or continuance commitment (cf. Khan et al. 2018; Aslam et al. 2012), job involvement (Chiu and Tsai, 2006), employee engagement (Adnan et al. 2021), structural empowerment (Gilbert et al. 2010).

As pointed out earlier, such research has been limited to commercial and public organisations, and no study of this kind conducted in NPOs was found. Kang (2012) was the only one who examined the relationship between JB and OCBs in - as he himself put it - ‘private social welfare organisations’. However, it concerned only a selected category of employees, namely social workers. In the same vein, research by Schepman and Zarate (2008) was carried out among social service workers conducting direct service in small NPOs. By contrast, Van Emmerik et al. (2003) analysed the relationship between altruism and volunteering and moderating effects of burnout, but the volunteering part only concerned bank, city council or university employees.

The lack of such research constitutes a research gap because, as far as the performance of staff in NPOs is concerned, a stark difference can be observed compared to for-profit and public organisations. Comparative studies have highlighted differences between the three sectors, e.g. in the field of values and job attitudes (Borzaga and Tortia, 2006; Goulet and Frank, 2002; Lyons et al. 2006; Mirvis, 1992), work practices (Kalleberg et al. 2006). In addition, as has already been mentioned, the activities of NPOs rely on voluntary work, whereas research points to significant differences in dispositions (Elshaug and Metzer, 2001; Mitani, 2014) and attitudes (Laczo and Hanish, 1999; Pearce, 1993; cf. Liao-Troth, 2001) between paid workers and volunteers.

The results of the analysis became the basis for the formulation the following research hypothesis:

H: Job burnout is negatively correlated with OCBs among employees of nonprofit organisations.
5. Methods

5.1. Sample

The cross-sectional study was conducted in 2022, in Poland’s Lubuskie Voivodeship. The research findings presented here are part of a larger research project examining OCB in three types of entities: for-profit, nonprofit and public organizations.

The sample consisted of 100 employees of NPOs. The participation in the study was voluntary. The sampling was non-random because no list of employees working in nonprofit organisations of Lubuskie Voivodeship was available. Respondents’ opinions were collected using a Google Form, through direct contact and in cooperation with Ośrodek Wsparcia Ekonomii Społecznej in Zielona Góra (Support Centre of Social Economy).

There were more women (68%) than men among the respondents. The average age of participants in the research was 42.5. Most respondents (38%) had work experience in the current organisation ranging from 4 to 10 years, slightly fewer (36%) - longer than 10 years. Persons with the seniority in the current workplace shorter than 3 years were the least represented (26%).

Most representatives of nonprofit entities were board members (43%). One in four (26%) was a paid employee. Members of organisations (19%) and volunteers (12%) were less represented. They were mainly active in associations (79%) or foundations (18%). More than every third NPO representatives (38%) worked for an entity employing 10 or fewer people, and fewer respondents - in an organisation employing 11 to 20 people (31%) or more than 50 people (22%). Respondents working for entities employing from 20 to 49 people were the least represented (9%).

Nonprofits acting in the area of social and humanitarian aid, rescue (50%) and/or health care (33%) were the most numerous. There were relatively many representatives of entities involved in education and upbringing, R&D activities, scientific research (28%), as well as in sport, tourism, leisure, hobby (26%), local development (22%), culture and arts (18%). Respondents working on environmental protection (9%), support for NPOs and civic initiatives (8%) and/or religion (3%) were the least represented.
5.2. Measures

Various research tools are used to measure OCB, e.g. those developed by: Fox et al. (2012), Konovsky and Organ (1996), Lee and Allen (2002), Podsakoff et al. (1990), Spector et al. (2010), Williams and Anderson (1991). In the course of our own research we used – similarly to e.g. Glińska-Neweś and Szostek (2018) - the 12-item OCB scale developed by Spector (Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Checklist; retrieved from: http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/ocbcpage.html, 26.01.2018 – access date). Respondents were asked to select one of the answers on a 5-point scale (never -1, once or twice - 2, once or twice a month - 3, once or twice a week - 4, every day - 5). The scale value was calculated as the simple average – from 1 to 5. 6 items concerned behaviours directed toward the organisation (OCB-O), while the other 6 items concerned behaviours directed toward people in the organisation (OCB-P).

The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory\(^1\) – a tool developed by Demerouti et al. (2001) – was used to measure JB among respondents. The Polish language version of the OLBI tool, prepared by Cieślak (Baka and Cieślak, 2010), was applied. This questionnaire consists of 16 items, 8 of which concern disengagement and the other 8 - exhaustion. Respondents give their answers on a 4-point scale, where 1 means ‘I strongly agree’ and 4 - ‘I strongly disagree’. Each subscale includes 4 items that are positively framed and 4 items that are negatively framed. Positively framed items should be reverse. The subscale score (range 1-4) is the sum of the items’ scores divided by their number for the subscales of exhaustion and disengagement (Baka and Basińska, 2016).

5.3. Data analysis

Statistical analysis of the data was performed using the Statistica software. Internal consistency was confirmed by the standard Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951). The following values were adopted: 0.734440132\(^2\) (for the OCB-O subscale), 0.770730380 (OCB-P), 0.734658309 (JB - disengagement), 0.797883753 (JB - exhaustion). Subsequently, factoring in the results of the Shapiro-

\(^1\) The OLBI was used, as it can be used to various professional groups and concerns all employees regardless of the industry or sector that they work (Baka and Basińska, 2016).

\(^2\) The scales forming part of the tool should exhibit a value of the α -Cronbach’s coefficient larger than 0.7. Questionnaires whose α -Cronbach’s coefficient is smaller than 0.6 should not be used (Brzeziński, 2011).
Wilk tests (Shapiro and Wilk, 1965), a decision was made to treat the distribution of the variables OCB-O, OCB-P, as well as of ‘job burnout - disengagement’ and ‘job burnout - exhaustion’ as normal distributions (table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>0.983197</td>
<td>0.233838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-P</td>
<td>0.986154</td>
<td>0.383313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job burnout -disengagement</td>
<td>0.988592</td>
<td>0.552857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job burnout -exhaustion</td>
<td>0.986541</td>
<td>0.407524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own study

Since the variables presented a distribution close to normal, the use of Pearson’s correlation coefficient r to analyse the relevant correlations was considered. This, however, was ruled out as the relationship between the variables did not turn out to be rectilinear. Given that conditions for calculating Pearson’s r correlation coefficient were not met, it became necessary to use its non-parametric equivalent - Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient.

6. Results

The research demonstrates that, in what concerns the OCB-O subscale, the respondents awarded min. 9 and max. 29 points, whereas for the OCB-P subscale, the awarded ratings were min. 6 and max. 30 points. The arithmetic means differed slightly and stood at 17.42 and 17.36, respectively. The standard deviation was higher for the OCB-P subscale (4.5182 vs. 4.0755) (table 2). The mean score for the OCB-O subscale (3.152) was a bit higher than for the OCB-P subscale (3.037).

---

3 In the case of the Shapiro-Wilk test, the null hypothesis for this test is that the test sample comes from a normally distributed population. If the p-value is less than the conventional level of 0.05, then we reject the hypothesis of normality, otherwise we do not reject it (Dudley, 2012).
When analysing the data sourced from the OLBI questionnaire, it was found that in the case of the disengagement subscale, the respondents awarded slightly less points than in the case of exhaustion, i.e. a minimum of 8 and 9 points (respectively) and a maximum of 27 and 29 points (respectively). The arithmetic mean was also lower for the disengagement subscale (17.56 vs. 18.27), as was the standard deviation (3.9704 vs. 4.3380) (table 2).

Table 2. OCB-O, OCB-P, job burnout – disengagement, job burnout – exhaustion – selected descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.0755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-P</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.5182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job burnout - disengagement</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.9704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job burnout – exhaustion</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own study

Let us note that the average score for the disengagement subscale was a bit lower (2.195) than for the exhaustion subscale (2.284). Both values indicate a moderate level of JB in the analysed dimensions.

To test the research hypothesis regarding the correlation between OCB (OCB-O and OCB-P) and job burnout (in the dimensions: disengagement and exhaustion), a correlation analysis was carried out using Spearman’s rho coefficient. The results of the study were interpreted in accordance with the Dancey and Reidy (2004) classification. The analyses revealed only negligible correlations between variables: OCB-O and job burnout – disengagement (r=.043675; p <.05), OCB-P and job burnout – disengagement (r=.112983; p <.05), OCB-O and job burnout - exhaustion (r= -.000526; p <.05), and OCB-P and job

---

4 The stanine standards: exhaustion scores below 1.90 indicate a low level of exhaustion, 1.91-2.74 – a moderate level, and higher than 2.75 – a high level; disengagement scores below 1.88 indicate a low level, 1.89-2.71 – a moderate level, and higher than 2.72 – a high level (Baka and Basińska, 2016).

5 Interpretation of Spearman’s rho: ≥0.70 (very strong relationship), 0.40-0.69 (strong relationship), 0.30-0.39 (moderate relationship), 0.20-0.29 (weak relationship), 0.01-0.19 (no or negligible relationship) (Dancey and Reidy, 2004).
burnout - exhaustion (r=.088092; p < .05). We therefore did not gain formal statistical support for our hypothesis.

7. Discussion

Research on the correlation between JB and OCBs in for-profits and public entities does not bring clear results. However, some of the studies have managed to capture a negative correlation between the individual dimensions of both variables (e.g. Cropanzano et al. 2003; Sesen et al. 2011; Van Emmerik et al. 2005). As per our findings, such a relationship does not occur in the case of NPOs. The results are therefore not consistent with the conclusions presented by Kang (2012). Let us recall that Kant’s study covered only social workers, whereas our research concerned a broader spectrum of categories of nonprofit employees: management, members of the organisation, paid employees, volunteers, all of whom were active not only in the area of social and humanitarian assistance or health care but were also engaged in: education and upbringing, scientific research, R&D, sport, tourism, leisure, hobbies, local development, or culture and arts.

The question arises: why is there no significant relationship between OCBs and job burnout in nonprofit organisations? The importance of factors that mediate or moderate the analysed relation should be verified in subsequent in-depth research where it might be worth exploring the specificity of employees of nonprofit organisations in terms of their characteristics (Elshaug and Metzer, 2001; Mitani, 2014) or job attitudes (Borzaga and Tortia, 2006; Goulet and Frank, 2002; Laczo and Hanish, 1999; Lyons et al. 2006; Mirvis, 1992; Pearce, 1993). It also seems advisable to consider the specificity of the work culture of nonprofit organisations as mentioned e.g. by Whitman (2009) or Rothschild and Milofsky (2006).

Let us also highlight another related issue that emerged in van Emmerik et al. (2003), with whose findings our own results may be partially consistent. Those authors demonstrated that job burnout is associated with OCBs, but not with volunteerism or helping kin and neighbours. This might imply that JB affects OCBs in the workplace, but not volunteering (which is an important resource in nonprofit organisations).

Let us also stress that in Poland the line between volunteering and paid work is somewhat blurred. Polish NPOs tend to be small organisations, and due to labour costs, they struggle to depart from exclusively voluntary activities towards full-time employment (Charycka et al. 2020). As a consequence, the
requirements towards employees exceed what stems from their contract and role (Charycka et al. 2020). This state of affairs may have influenced the results of our study. This shows how important the cultural context can prove in this type of research. After all, the nonprofit sector is marked by great diversity across different countries. It differs in terms of its level of development, e.g. in the area of: organisational capacity, financial viability, sectoral infrastructure (CSO Sustainability Index Explorer), as well as in terms of applied institutional solutions (Salamon and Anheier, 1997). On the other hand, meanwhile, this also highlights the need for a theoretical clarification of the boundaries between OCB and volunteering within nonprofit organisations.

8. Conclusions

The presented research showed a negligible correlation between dimensions of OCB (OCB-O, OCB-P) and dimensions of job burnout (exhaustion and disengagement) in NPOs. This may indicate the dissimilarity of the analyzed relationship in this type of entities, since most of the presented studies carried out among companies and public organizations showed the existence of a stronger relationship between analysed variables. The contribution of this study is that the OCB-JB correlation analysis was conducted in NPOs, which has not been done before.

9. Limitations and future directions of the research

The study was only quantitative and not qualitative. The study relied only on respondents’ subjective statements. The scope and detail of the questions in the survey questionnaire had to be limited, making it difficult to collect complete or nuanced data. The small sample of employees of nonprofits was surveyed. This sample was selected purposively, which means the findings cannot be generalised, and the study considered only Polish NPOs, meaning it was embedded in a specific cultural context that should be accounted while formulating conclusions. Additionally, the research was not a longitudinal study. The data were lagged, which does not allow for strong causal inference. Furthermore, the questionnaire-based research used may have led to common method bias because it was used the same tool to collect various data from survey participants.

A better understanding of the analysed problem would require more in-depth qualitative research. Future research using longitudinal data is also
recommended. It is also reasonable to consider carrying out a study that will analyse factors which mediate or moderate the relationship between JB and OCBs in nonprofits.

Abstract

Organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) are behaviours that go beyond the formal role and are organizationally functional. They may be linked, among others, to job burnout. This relationship has been studied in for-profit and public organisations. No such studies have been found for nonprofit entities operating in different areas. The aim of the article is to verify whether there is a correlation between job burnout and organisational citizenship behaviours among employees of nonprofits. To this end, survey research was conducted in 2022. A statistical analysis of the obtained data was performed using the Statistica software. It was found that the relationship under analysis does not occur in NPOs.
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